

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-5, and 11 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1, 3, 4, 5 and 11 are amended; Claims 2, 6-10 and 12-13 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer; and Claims 13-29 are indicated as withdrawn as being drawn to a non-elected invention. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of Claim 2, Claim 4 has been amended to incorporate the subject of Claim 1, and Claim 11 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of canceled Claim 8. Further claim amendments are presented only to correct matters of form or correct claim dependencies. Thus, no new matter is presented.

The outstanding Official Action presents the following issues: the Title of the invention was objected to as not being descriptive of the claimed invention; the Abstract was objected to for being of improper length and containing legal phraseology; the specification was objected to for including an embedded hyperlink; Claims 3 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to have proper antecedent basis; Claims 1, 6-10, and 12-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Liao et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,292,833, hereinafter "Liao"); Claims 2-3 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as anticipated by Liao in view of Marko et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,686,880, hereinafter "Marko"); and Claims 4 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as anticipated by Liao in view of Hirota (JP 02002112156A, hereinafter "Hirota").

In response to the objection to the Title of the Invention, a new title is provided which is believed to be clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. Further, in response to the objection to the abstract, the abstract has been amended to be of proper length and exclude any legal phraseology or language used in the Title. Also, in response to the objection to the specification for including an embedded hyperlink, the specification has

been amended to incorporate the recommendation provided in the Official Action to overcome this objection.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the outstanding objections to the Title, Abstract and Specification be withdrawn.

Claims 3 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for failing to have proper antecedent basis. In response, Claim 3 has been amended to read “said first information processing apparatus” instead of “said first information processing means” and is now believed to have proper antecedent basis, and Claim 5 has been amended to recite “a user” instead of “the user”.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of Claims 3 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claims 1 and 4 state novel features clearly not taught or rendered obvious by the prior art of record.

Amended Claim 1 is directed to an information processing apparatus connected by a network to a first information processing apparatus for presenting content. The information processing apparatus includes an acquisition means for acquiring information on the first information processing apparatus, and information on content presented by the first information processing apparatus from the first information processing apparatus. A generation means generates information processing apparatus identification information for identifying the first information processing apparatus and generates content identification information to identify content on the basis of the information on the first information processing apparatus and the content which are acquired by the acquisition means. A storage means then stores the information processing apparatus identification information and the content identification information by associating the information processing apparatus identification information with the content identification information. The information stored

in the storage means is then transmitted by a transmitting means to a second information processing apparatus in response to a request made by the second information processing apparatus through the network.

When the information processing apparatus identification information and the content identification information are disseminated by broadcasting, the acquisition means further acquires broadcasting identification information assigned to the broadcasting and the storage means stores the broadcasting information by associating the broadcasting information with the information processing apparatus identification information and the content information.

In this manner, the system to which Claim 1 is directed provides the ability to allow transactions to be performed in an efficient manner with a high degree of security with regard to both the content provider and the content recipient.<sup>1</sup>

Amended Claim 1 recites, *inter alia* an information processing apparatus, comprising:

“...a generation means for generating information processing apparatus identification information for identifying said first information processing apparatus and generating content identification information for identifying content ...”

The outstanding Official Action relies on Liao as describing a generation means for generating information processing apparatus identification information for identifying the first information processing apparatus.

Liao describes a method and apparatus for providing access control to local services of mobile devices. Specifically, Liao describes that a mobile device 102 is configured to receive a message over a network from a remote server 110 and that the mobile device 102 is able to obtain a service identify for the obtained message 308.<sup>2</sup> Liao describes that the mobile device 102 identifies the origin of the message and that this identity may be part of the message or can be inferred by the mobile device based on the information/knowledge the

---

<sup>1</sup> Specification at page 3, lines 1-4.

<sup>2</sup> Liao at col. 7, lines 5-8.

mobile device has for the message.<sup>3</sup> Liao describes that the message itself may contain no service identity of any form, but the mobile device is able to infer the service identity from the fact that the message is linked with another message which explicitly contains a service identity.<sup>4</sup> However, Liao fails to teach or suggest that information processing apparatus identification information is generated in any way.

Amended Claim 1 recites a generation means for generating information processing apparatus identification information for identifying the first information processing apparatus. As discussed above, Liao describes that a service identity for a received message may be obtained or inferred from a received message.<sup>5</sup> This identification information may be then compared with a list of stored authorized service identities in order to determine if the received message is from an authorized source.<sup>6</sup> Thus, Liao describes that the identification information may be obtained from a received message or obtained by determining that the received message is linked with another message which explicitly contains a service identity.<sup>7</sup> However, Liao fails to teach or suggest a generation means for generating information processing apparatus identification information for identifying the first information processing apparatus, as recited in amended Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn. For substantially the same reasons as given with respect to amended Claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 4, as amended, also patentably defines over Liao.

The Official Action rejected Claims 3-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over the combination of Liao, Marko, and/or Hirota. As discussed above, Liao, fails to teach or disclose a generation means for generating information processing apparatus identification

---

<sup>3</sup> Liao at col. 7, lines 10-18.

<sup>4</sup> Liao at col. 7, lines 18-22.

<sup>5</sup> Liao at col. 7, lines 6-10.

<sup>6</sup> Liao at col. 7, lines 23-25.

<sup>7</sup> Liao at col. 7, lines 18-22.

information. Likewise, Marko, nor Hirota remedy this deficiency, and therefore, none of the cited references, either alone or in combination, disclose or suggest Applicant's Claims 1 and 3-5 which include the above-distinguished claims limitations by virtue of independent recitation or dependency. Therefore, the Official Action does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to many of these claims.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 1 and 3-5 in view of the applied prior art be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 11 states novel features clearly not taught or rendered obvious by the prior art of record.

Claim 8 recites, *inter alia*, an information processing apparatus, comprising:

“...a request means for transmitting said content identification information and said first information processing apparatus identification information...to a second information processing apparatus...”

The Official Action cites Liao as describing a request means for transmitting said content identification information and said first information processing apparatus identification extracted by the extraction means. To support this assertion, the Official Action cites Liao at col. 13, lines 56 through col. 14, line 25. However, the cited portion of Liao simply describes that user diagram protocol (UDP) interface 702 is used to perform processing on messages received from the remote computing device. The cited portion of Liao states that the input device 762 allows the user of the mobile device 750 to input data and make selections controlling and using the mobile device 750.

Amended Claim 8 recites an extraction means for extracting content identification information for identifying a content presented by a first information processing apparatus and request means for transmitting said content identification information and said first information processing apparatus identification information to a second information processing apparatus. Liao fails to teach or suggest a request means for transmitting content

identification information and information processing apparatus identification information to a second information processing apparatus. The cited portion of Liao simply describes that a device identification is used to transmit information to and from the mobile device 750 to and from the network gateway 608. Liao, however, at no point teaches or suggests transmitting identification information regarding content or an information apparatus to a second information processing apparatus whatsoever. Instead, Liao describes that the mobile device 750 stores identification information of devices with which they communicate and that this information is used to manage communications between the mobile device and external processing devices to which the stored identification information corresponds. Thus, Liao fails to teach or suggest a request means for transmitting said content identification information and said first information processing apparatus identification information...to a second information processing apparatus, as recited in amended Claim 11.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

The Official Action has also rejected Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over the combination of Liao and Marko. However, as discussed above, Liao fails to teach or disclose a request means for transmitting said content identification information and said first information processing apparatus identification information...to a second information processing apparatus. Likewise, Marko fails to remedy this deficiency, and therefore, none of the cited references, either alone or in combination, disclose or suggests Applicant's Claim 11 which includes the above distinguished limitation by virtue of independent recitation. Therefore, the Official Action does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to any of these claims.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 1, 3-5 and 11 is patentably distinguishing over the prior art. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early an favorable recondition of the application is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



---

Bradley D. Lytle  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)

I:\ATTY\ATH\PROSECUTION\20's\204947US-AM.DOC